

**Remarks**

Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are currently pending in the Application.

**Advisory Action**

In the Advisory Action dated November 9, 2005, the Examiner states that amendments to Claims 1 and 10 require further search and/or consideration. In view of the Examiner's position, Applicants would expect the presently presented claims to be allowed if the Examiner's search yields no other references.

**Claim amendments**

This response amends Claim 1 to clarify the scope of the invention by further reciting that "an axially symmetric electrical field is generated between the first and the second electrodes" (emphasis added). It is to be understood that the electrical field is not just generated between that ends of the electrodes but is generated along the entire length of the electrodes as shown in Figures 5B and 6B. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in Figures 5B and 6B of the specification. No new matter has been added.

This response amends Claim 10 to clarify the scope of the invention by further reciting that "an axially symmetric electrical field is generated between the four electrodes" (emphasis added). It is to be understood that the electrical field is not just generated between that ends of the electrodes but is generated along the entire length of the electrodes as shown in Figures 5B and 6B. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in Figures 5B and 6B of the specification. No new matter has been added.

**Claim objections**

The Examiner objects to Claim 1 for reciting "each pair of electrode pairs comprising." The Examiner asserts that this language suggests a pair of pairs of electrodes. Applicants submit that Claim 1 has been amended to recite "each electrode pair comprising" and request that the objection be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection in view of Jackson (U.S. Patent No. 5,572,344)**

Claims 1, 6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner is reminded that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP 2131 quoting *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co, of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The Examiner is also reminded that “[the] identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” MPEP 2131 quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants submit that Jackson does not teach each and every element as set forth in the rejected claims. In particular:

**Claim 1**

Applicants submit that Jackson does not disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by amended Claim 1 of the present application:

“an axially symmetric electrical field is generated **between** the first and the second electrodes to change the arrangement of the liquid crystal molecules” (emphasis added)

The Examiner asserts that “the first and the second electrodes” as recited in Claim 1 are disclosed by Jackson’s electrodes “16-22.” See page 2, last paragraph of the Official Action.

Jackson discloses a varying electric field that is created between a field electrode “26” and a resistance layer “14.” See column 3, lines 5-7, line 52 and line 60; column 4, lines 8-9 of Jackson. According to Jackson, the field electrode “26” is located **above** the electrodes “16-22.” See Figure 1 of Jackson. Because Jackson’s electric field is between electrodes that are disposed vertically from each other, Jackson does not teach, disclose or suggest “electrical field is generated between the first and the second electrodes” wherein “the first and the second electrodes” are “disposed on the first substrate” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Jackson and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 6 and 8-9, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also believed to be patentable over Jackson.

Claim 10

Applicants submit that, at least for the reasons stated above, Jackson does not teach, disclose or suggest “electrical field is generated between the four electrodes” where in the “four electrodes” are “disposed on the first substrate” as recited in amended Claim 10. Hence, Claim 10 is patentable over Jackson and should be allowed by the Examiner.

**35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection in view of Wiltshire (U.S. Patent No. 5,313,562)**

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wiltshire. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 10

Applicants submit that Wiltshire does not disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 10 of the present application:

“four electrodes disposed on the first substrate and **at corners** of each display cell” (emphasis added)

The Examiner asserts that a “display cell” as recited in Claim 10 is disclosed by Wiltshire’s cell “1.” See page 5, lines 10-11 of the Official Action. The Examiner also asserts that “four electrodes” as recited in Claim 10 is disclosed by Wiltshire’s electrodes “9-12.” See page 5, lines 15-16 of the Official Action. Applicants respectfully disagree

According to Wiltshire, the electrodes “9-12” run from the center of each side of the cell “1” to the center of the cell “1.” See Figure 1 of Wiltshire. Because Wiltshire’s electrodes “9-12” are not disposed at the corners of cell “1,” Wiltshire

does not teach, disclose or suggest “four electrodes disposed on the first substrate and **at corners** of each display cell” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 10.

Hence, Claim 10 is patentable over Wiltshire and should be allowed by the Examiner.

### **35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection**

Claims 2-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Jackson and further in view of Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 6,642,984). Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Jackson and further in view of Hiroshi (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,186).

Applicants submit that Claims 2-5, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are believed to be patentable over Jackson, Yoshida and Hiroshi, because there is no *prima facie* 35 USC 103(a) case based on Jackson, as shown above, and because the Examiner has not shown to Applicants where Yoshida and Hiroshi disclose, teach or suggest the features not found in Jackson.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mails Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents POB 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

January 5, 2006  
(Date of Deposit)

Shannon Tinsley  
(Name of Person Signing)

Tinsley  
(Signature)

January 5, 2006  
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 43,010  
LADAS & PARRY  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, California 90036  
(323) 934-2300

Encls:  
A Request for Continued Examination;  
A petition for a two-month extension of time;  
Postcard.